

Kelly Johnson

From:

DOCKETED

Sent: To:

Subject:

APR 7 2017

DOCKETED BY

RECEIVED M FOGERTY <fogerty47@msn.com>

AZ CORP COMMISSION Tuesday, March 28, 2017 2:12 PM Dunn-Web; Little-Web; Forese-Web; TOOM Web; RBurns-Web

Docket #E Alza Corposed Some 1993 ASA - 16-0123; Proposed rate Increases

DOCKETED

Arizona Corporation Commission

APR 0 7 2017

Chairman & Commissioners:

DOCKETED BY

We write requesting opposing rate increases, and high service charges proposed by APS.

As APS customers, we understand the need to provide reliable electricity to customers. However, by reducing the amount of energy used, customers can help APS reduce the need for costly infrastructure. The increases proposed in its rate plan ignore this fact and, in fact, punish consumers who work hard to reduce consumption.

We have done a great deal to reduce consumption! We've switched all lights to CFL bulbs. We replaced the water heater 5 yrs ago with a new solar tank & system. All windows have been replaced with vinyl, energy star U-Factor, etc. windows. In winter we set the heat at 68 only for morning or evening, off at night. During summer, the AC runs for 2 hours at 73 degrees in late afternoon. Some months we don't use the HVAC at all!

Despite our efforts, our bills go up each year, even when KWH used are the same! Really, I have kept a chart, noting KWH use, cost by month & day, days in bill cycle, and when the home is empty 4 or more days in the bill cycle, for eight years! When APS says the rates haven't changed, how come costs increase when the usage is same?! And- most months the cost of the actual electricity used is less than 50% of the bill total! All the add-on fees are ridiculous.

We strongly oppose the proposed HIGH monthly meter reading fee for having opted-out of the Smart Meter installation, which creates health complications for some of us! APS suggesting a fee of \$15-25/month is ridiculous! They're in the neighborhoods constantly! A two minute stop can't cost more than \$2-4/month.

The proposed monthly service fee change will negatively affect all customers, regardless of how much energy they use. This increase is unfair, as costs should be based on the amount of energy used by each customer. We urge the Commission to modify this provision as APS has not justified this significant increase.

We also oppose the mandatory residential demand charges and was pleased to see they are not included in the proposed settlement. Such a charge is also unfair, as it decreases incentive for consumers to reduce energy use during the rest of the month. I appreciate that the Commission did not approve these charges in the UNS and TEP rate cases, and I encourage you to please reject including them in the APS rate case, as well.

We're concerned that APS wants to automatically enroll new customers in its Time-of-Use rates, rather than allowing those customers to choose the best plan for their needs. People have different schedules. Some people may not be at home during the day, whereas others work at night or from home. Forcing these customers into one particular plan could drastically increase the amount they pay and also eliminates consumer choice. Further, the most effective time-of-use windows are three hours or less. Please consider modifying this in the proposal.

Finally, we want to express our strong support for energy efficiency and rooftop solar and encourage the Commission to support these clean energy programs in this and in other proceedings.

Thank you for accepting our user and constituent based comments on this issue.

Sincerely,

Michaela Fogerty

Robin Lemons

125 Horse Canyon Drive

Sedona, AZ 86351